DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 310 097 SP 031 404

TITLE Elementary, Secondary, and University Education: A Partnership Commitment in Missouri. Report of a Conference (Columbia, Missouri, September 13-14, 1985).

INSTITUTION Missouri Univ., Columbia. Coll. of Education.

PUB DATE 85

NOTE 50p.

PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Career Choice; *College Bound Students; *College School Cooperation; Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Long Range Planning; *Professional Development; *Teaching (Occupation)

ABSTRACT

The conference described in this paper was designed to provide a meaningful experience for a select group of individuals in strategic positions to have an impact on education policy for the state of Missouri. The report summarizes the scope and purpose the the conference, the conference process, and major issues and recommendations for action, concluding with the conference resolution. The conference focused on the following three major issues: (1) the expectations of university educators for Missouri high school graduates who choose to attend the university; (2) the selection and preparation of individuals who choose teaching as a career; and (3) the role of schools and the university in the continuing development of educational personnel as well as the university's research and service role in support of the elementary and secondary school enterprise. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED310097

Report

and University Education

M.N

A Partnership Commitment to Mission

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Behymer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP031 404

Elementary, Secondary and University Education:

A Partnership Commitment

A Conference Report

Fall, 1985

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Preface 1

Scope and Purpose of the Conference 1

The Conference Process 5

Major Issues and Recommendations for Action . . . 7

The Transition from High School to College . . 8

Teacher Preparation 13

Inservice Development of Educators and Collaboration with Schools 22

A Resolution of Affirmation 34

Appendices

Preconference Planning Committee 35

Conferees 36

Conference Agenda 43

PREFACE

The Conference on Elementary, Secondary, and University Education: A Partnership Commitment held at the University of Missouri-Columbia in September, 1985, provided a meaningful experience for a select group of individuals in strategic positions to have impact on education policy for the state of Missouri. This report summarizes the scope and purpose of the Conference, Conference process, and major issues and recommendations for action. The report concludes with the Conference resolution.

The Conference focused on the following three major issues: (1) the expectations of university educators for Missouri high school graduates who choose to attend the University; (2) the selection and preparation of individuals who choose teaching as a career; and (3) the role of schools and the University in the continuing development of educational personnel as well as the university's research and service role in support of the elementary and secondary school enterprise.

The Conference Planning Committee, co-chaired by Dean Milton Glick of the UMC College of Arts and Science and Dean Bob G. Woods of the UMC College of Education, was composed of Dr. Russell Thompson, Superintendent of the Columbia Public Schools; Dr. Wayne Walker, Principal of the Rock Bridge High School; Dr. H. W. Schooling, Chancellor Emeritus of UMC; Dr. Charles Campbell, Associate Vice Provost of Extension for Conferences and Specialized Services; Dr. Charles Koelling, Associate Dean, College of Education; Dr. Ted Tarkow, Associate Dean, College of Arts and Science; Dr. Tom Good, Acting Director, UMC Center for Research in Social Behavior; and Dr. W. R. Miller, Associate Dean, College of Education.

The Conference Planning Committee developed a "Scope and Purpose Statement" that guided the conference planning activities. As a part of the planning effort, the Committee invited a group of Missouri citizens (see Appendix A) to the Columbia campus of the University in February, 1985, to assist in the identification of issues to be addressed by the Conference as well as strategies which might be employed during a Fall, 1985, Conference.

In addition to members of the Conference Planning Committee, we wish to acknowledge the contribution of principal authors of this conference report: Professors Jo Behymer, Carl Fehrle, Richard Hatley, Charles Koelling, W. R. Miller, Charles Schmitz and Ted Tarkow.

If no action occurs as a result of the Conference, the Conference becomes no more than a stimulating experience for participants. After reviewing the Conference report, we challenge you to **ACT** to make the recommendations emanating from the Conference **happen** in the state of Missouri.

Bob G. Woods, Dean
College of Education

Milton Glick, Dean
College of Arts and Science

SCOPE AND PURPOSE OF THE CONFERENCE

Elementary, Secondary and University Education:
A Partnership Commitment

Conference Goals

The primary goal of the Conference was to assist UMC in the further delineation of its role related to the following UM Board of Curators long-range planning objective, "to develop ways to assist the State to improve the quality of education in the public school system."

Conference Purposes

An invitational Conference provided an opportunity for selected Missourians who are in positions to influence educational policy decisions

1. To take an in-depth view of significant questions related to three major issues that impact the quality of elementary, secondary and university education in Missouri. These issues are concerned with

    a. the key elements that effect the successful transition from high school to college,

    b. the important elements to be considered in the selection, admission, and preparation of teachers and other educational personnel, and

    c. the need for the continued involvement of institutions of higher education in the inservice development of professional educators and service to elementary and secondary schools.

2. To identify and examine the linkages between the University and elementary and secondary education that relate to these three issues.

3. To discuss the issues and related problems facing education as well as to recommend solutions.

4. To reinforce the importance of teaching to the well-being of education and the state of Missouri.

5. To gain a better understanding of the economic and social consequences resulting from the level of support provided for Missouri's total program of elementary, secondary and university education.

Anticipated Outcomes

An invitational Conference should yield:

1. Mechanism(s) for assuring continuing dialogue and interaction between the University and various constituent groups representing elementary and secondary education related to continuing development of professional education.

2. An opportunity to communicate the relative success of students making the transition from Missouri high schools and community colleges to the University.

3. An opportunity to demonstrate the University's commitment to the full range of education in general and to the development of teachers and other educational personnel in particular.

4. The identification of current UMC resources as well as additional resources that can be of use in the improvement of elementary and secondary education through research, development and service activities.

5. A clearer understanding of UMC's role related to elementary and secondary education in the context of the University of Missouri's role.

6. The clarification of the role of elementary and secondary schools in the preparation and continuing development of professional education.

7. Recommendations that become a compact between the University and elementary and secondary education for the improvement of education.

Strategies and Considerations

1. Volunteered UMC as host and facilitator.

2. Appointed an initial conference planning committee representing UMC College of Arts and Science, College of Education, Extension Division and Columbia Public Schools.

3. Identified collaborative models for teacher preparation and development as well as effective interaction among universities, local education agencies and the state education agency.

4. Identified and prioritized educational issues, selecting three issues to become conference foci.

5. Identified a Preconference Planning Committee of 12-15 influential Missourians to endorse and/or modify the preplanning efforts of local UMC Conference Planning Committee.

6. Invited UMKC and UMSL representatives to review the Conference plan, and offer suggestions.

7. Commissioned papers on selected educational issues.

8. Invited UM as well as DESE and DHE personnel for specified roles.

9. Invited participants representing various constituent groups interested in the continuing development of education in the state of Missouri.

10. Analyzed issues and identified questions to form the basis for interaction of conferees.

11. Planned Conference schedule of activities.

12. Invited speakers for general sessions.

13. Selected moderators and recorders for discussion sessions.

THE CONFERENCE PROCESS

Faculty members at the University of Missouri-Columbia wrote position papers to serve as background information which were mailed to conferees prior to the conference. The booklet of position papers provided an overview of the three issues that were to be addressed at the Conference.

In addition, four outstanding educators presented the results of their research and expertise related to these three issues. The presenters and their topics were:

"Reform in Teacher Education"

Dr. Judith Lanier, Dean
College of Education
Michigan State University

"Improving Education in Missouri: Toward Educational Excellence"

Dr. C. Peter Magrath
President
University of Missouri

"University/Public School Collaboration"

Dr. Lee Shulman, Professor
Stanford University

"Educational Partnerships: A Perspective"

Dr. Arthur Mallory
Commissioner of Education
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education

Each Conference participant was assigned to one of the nine discussion groups. Each group consisted of approximately ten people in addition to a moderator and a recorder. Each group was assigned one of the three issues and met for interaction three times during the first day of the Conference. On the second day, the three groups discussing the same issue met together to further explore and suggest recommendations related to their assigned issue. (See Appendix C for Conference Agenda.)

In the small group meetings, a list of questions concerning the issue provided the framework within which the issue could be pursued. However, each group was encouraged to pursue additional questions that would lead to meaningful recommendations. The objective of each group was to draw conclusions related to the assigned issue followed by recommendations which would facilitate a working partnership between the University of Missouri-Columbia, represented by the Colleges of Arts and Science and Education and the elementary and secondary schools of the state.

The moderators and recorders from groups that discussed the same issue met after each session to compare results of the discussions and formulate recommendations to be considered by the groups. The resulting conclusions and recommendations were subsequently presented to all participants in the final session of the Conference.

A Resolution of Affirmation (included at the end of this Conference Report) was presented and accepted by the Conference participants.

MAJOR ISSUES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ACTION

The Transition from High School to College

Teacher Preparation

Inservice Development of Educators and Collaboration with Schools

The Transition from High School to College

The National Center for Education Statistics reported in September, 1985, that 25 percent of all college freshmen in the academic year 1983-84 enrolled in at least one course in remedial mathematics; 21 percent enrolled in a remedial writing course; and 16 percent enrolled in a remedial reading course (National Center for Education Statistics Bulletin, September, 1985).

Statistics such as these serve to highlight, in a global way, one aspect of the broad topic addressed by the groups that discussed the issue of "transition" during the Conference, "Elementary, Secondary, and University Education: A Partnership Commitment." Whether one speaks of a large public institution offering ninth grade algebra with instructors accustomed to presenting at the university level suddenly finding themselves teaching at the junior high level or of students who are assigned to "remedial" (or the new euphemism, "developmental") courses with the result being a shattering of their confidence at the outset of their college career, one speaks of an issue of enormous complexity. There are questions pertaining to appropriate use of limited budgets; there are questions pertaining to the "efficacy of it all" (How many students who enroll in university-offered remedial courses in fact graduate?); there are political questions raised as legislators, and others, seek to define or redefine a university's mission in light of what, in fact, it finds itself obliged to do. Finally, there are questions pertaining to the particular responsibilities of each level of education in working to reduce the scope of this problem.

All four speakers at the Conference, together with the members of the "transition" discussion groups, addressed many of these issues. If there was a consensus, it was that universities and secondary schools must become partners if significant progress is to be made. Those who teach at the university level have a moral and, indeed, practical responsibility for influencing the educational process at the secondary level so that the fiscal and human costs involved in "transition" can be reduced. Those who teach at the secondary level have an obligation to maintain familiarity with various disciplines so that their students are prepared to meet the challenge that college-level work in those disciplines will require. And finally, those who bear primary responsibility for the preparation of teachers have an obligation to graduate young teachers who do not believe that their formal education stops when the diploma, or the teaching certificate, is granted.

Recommendations

All university and secondary personnel should encourage greater personal interaction of the four campuses of the University of Missouri and secondary schools through forums, faculty consultantships, mailings and media programs in order to communicate information and expectations about college-level performance.

Rationale: Some form of regular communication to counselors, and perhaps to college-bound high school students, might allow the University--and particularly its core-discipline departments--to share information concerning appropriate levels of high school preparation in particular disciplines with

secondary school populations. There was strong sentiment that such documents not be drawn up by the University in a vacuum, but in close cooperation with secondary schools, and, perhaps, with the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

The University should share the content of tests from specific disciplines and programs.

Rationale: Sharing the content of tests would assist in predicting probable student success in the University classroom. Student performance on college and university placement tests should be shared with the secondary schools from which the student graduated.

The University should develop a systematic procedure to inform the high schools of the performance of their graduates.

Rationale: In this context, it is worth pointing out that for over 20 years the University has had an annual conference--the "Transition Conference"--at which representatives of the four campuses of the University of Missouri meet and discuss issues of mutual concern with representatives from all Missouri junior and community colleges. It is not inconceivable that an analogous annual conference, involving representatives of the University and various secondary schools, would go a long way in addressing this particular issue, as well as others.

The University must work with the high schools to define college-level competency.

Rationale: Although the University must give some level of priority to the needs of students for remediation, ways to reduce the need for remedial instruction must be found.

The University must encourage greater interaction between secondary school faculty and University faculty in the discipline areas.

Rationale: Monetary incentives and improved leave policies should be developed both by the University and secondary schools to facilitate such programs as summer institutes, faculty exchanges, and more involvement in discipline-related professional associations.

The University and the secondary schools must reaffirm the centrality of the fine arts, the humanities, and the social sciences to a liberal education.

Rationale: The reaffirmation is necessary so that the current, justifiable emphasis on "basic skills" does not, given the limitation of resources in our secondary schools, limit too severely the place of fine arts, the humanities, and the social sciences in the curriculum.

Although communication between teachers of chemistry (to cite but one example) at the secondary level and at the University level will allow progress to be made in the area of "transition," it is as important to remember that education is more than just specific-discipline driven.

Rationale: One can argue that the major purpose of education is the development in students of a series of abstract higher order thinking skills: evaluation, analysis, critical thinking, problem solving (especially involving mathematics), organization and reference skills, synthesis, application, creativity, decision making with incomplete information and communication skills in a variety of modes. Elementary schools, secondary schools and universities each have a role in this critical process. It is essential that each of the three components understand its own obligation and be prepared to assist the other two components towards fulfillment of their obligations if these more abstract thinking skills are to be taught successfully and if students are to make productive "transitions" from one level to the other in their more abstract educational maturation.

Teacher Preparation

The three groups that discussed the overarching issue of teacher preparation were virtually unanimous in their identification of five major questions confronting teacher education at the University of Missouri. In reality, the questions help to delineate the dimensions of the major issue of teacher preparation. The final recommendations adopted by the teacher education discussion groups are a clear reflection of the focus provided by the five questions as follows:

1. What should be the relative balance between liberal studies, pedagogy, and field-based experiences in a teacher preparation program? To what extent is teacher preparation a shared responsibility between the colleges of arts and science and the schools and colleges of education at the University of Missouri? What are the implications of this shared responsibility?

2. To what extent is teacher education a priority, or should be considered a priority, by the President of the University of Missouri and the Chancellors of the University campuses offering teacher preparation programs?

3. What are the implications of House Bill 463--which contains scholarship provisions for students entering teacher preparation programs--for the recruitment and preparation of teachers at the University of Missouri?

4. What are the implications of House Bill 463--particularly the section requiring faculty teaching preservice teacher education courses to further their professional development through direct personal involvement in the public schools--for the teacher education faculties at the University of Missouri?

5. Should teacher preparation at the University of Missouri be extended beyond the current four-year program, and what model of teacher preparation should be developed?

Historically, according to Dr. Judith Lanier (1984), Dean of the College of Education at Michigan State University, there has been a "broadly shared responsibility" for teacher education as well as a "continuing tension" among arts and science and teacher education faculty in institutions of higher education. In the broadest sense, Dr. Lanier believes that there should be more of an "all-university approach" to the preparation of teachers with arts and science and education faculties working more closely together in the preparation of teachers. Dr. C. Peter Magrath (1985), President of the University of Missouri, perhaps said it best when he discussed the preparation of the nation's teachers:

> They need at least as much knowledge of the subject to be taught as an undergraduate liberal arts major possesses. They need special knowledge in understanding how students learn concepts in a subject, and what to do if students have problems learning the material. Further, teachers need considerable practice in real situations where their work is criticized constructively.

Dr. Magrath (1985), in commenting on the report of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, recently said, ". . . I, for one, . . . believe education of new teachers will continue to be centered in our colleges and universities." Furthermore, Dr. Magrath indicated, "All citizens must accept responsibility for improved funding for our teacher education if the quality of education of our schools is to be truly improved." And finally, ". . . sufficient resources must be assigned to teacher education to provide thorough and rigorous programs." Unfortunately, history indicates according to Dean Lanier (1984), "Universities have never made and do not now make investments in teacher education that are commensurate with talk about the importance of teacher education. Overall responsibility and accountability for these programs is absent or nominal" (p. 132).

According to Dr. Lee Shulman (Shulman & Sykes, 1983), "If teaching is decreasingly attractive to young people, then raising standards and restricting entry misses the point. In addition to setting standards, public policy must provide incentives to make teaching more competitive as an occupation for the college-educated" (p. 105-106). In addition, Dr. Shulman (1983) states, "To make teaching more attractive to capable college graduates, policymakers must provide selective recruitment incentives. For example, federal and/or state agencies might establish scholarship or fellowship programs for undergraduate study in education" (p. 116-117). Dr. Peter Magrath (1985) provides further support for incentives to attract the brightest and best young people into the profession when he says, "It is dramatically clear that we are not attracting anywhere near the needed numbers of our brightest college students into teacher education programs."

Dr. Magrath (1985) provides perhaps the best support for the section of House Bill 463 requiring faculty teaching preservice teacher education

courses to further their professional development through direct personal involvement in the public schools when he says, "University faculty not only must teach undergraduates, but they must on a regular basis teach in the elementary and secondary schools." Since Dr. Magrath's point of view was supported by the teacher preparation discussion groups, the debate focused upon the methods by which the plan would be implemented. What would be the nature of the involvement? How much time should a teacher educator invest? Should exchange agreements be arranged between individual school districts and the schools and colleges of education? How frequently should this direct personal involvement occur? The consensus of the teacher preparation groups is best reflected by the following statement made by one of the members: "Specific plans for involvement between schools of education and the schools should be made. The plans should include a multiplicity of ways in which education faculty can get involved. Plans should be tailor-made for each education program and the cooperating schools."

Dr. Peter Magrath, past Chairman of the National Commission on Excellence in Teacher Education, has advocated the implementation of five-year preparation programs for teachers. More specifically, Dr. Magrath (1985) has advocated, ". . . following their completion of a teacher education program and the awarding of a provisional certificate, new teachers should complete an induction period or an internship of at least one year during which compensation would be provided." Dr. Judith Lanier (1984) has also voiced support for a supervised induction period. She has expressed concern about the lack of support provided for those entering teaching for the first time when she states, "Entry into the work of teaching has been described as 'abrupt' or

'unstaged,' with first-year teachers assuming the full responsibilities of the classroom from their very first day" (p. 120).

Recommendations

With the assistance of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education and local education agencies, the University of Missouri must establish teacher education as a priority.

Rationale: Many, including Dr. Lanier (1984), believe that support, particularly financial, for teacher education in the nation's colleges and universities has been woefully inadequate. To add to the dilemma of underfunding, according to Dr. Lanier, there is a problem with leadership as it relates to teacher education. In commenting on the leadership problem, Dr. Lanier (1984) says, "To support teacher education, someone in the university community must oversee governance arrangements to see that someone takes charge" (p. 109). Unless and until the central administration of a university system and/or campus places teacher education as a high priority, the resource base will continue to erode. To carry out research, to provide service, and to do a first rate job of professional personnel development takes money. The consensus of the groups was that continuous eloquent rhetoric without substantive action does a great disservice to the citizens of Missouri. The improvement of teacher education in Missouri

will take place only when the leadership of this University and others establish teacher education as a high priority.

The University of Missouri must participate in the scholarship program articulated in House Bill 463 (Excellence in Education Act of 1985) and has an obligation to provide funds commensurate with the number of students eligible for said scholarships.

Rationale: The groups discussing the issue of teacher preparation clearly affirmed that scholarship incentives should be provided to high-ability, high-achieving high school and junior/community college students who indicate an interest in becoming teachers. The groups were also cognizant of the fact that the number of available scholarships provided for in House Bill 463 would be substantially less than the number of eligible students who wished to attend the University of Missouri. Therefore, the groups urged the University to commit additional resources beyond the limited provisions of the legislation. These funds should be provided in proportion to the number of eligible students who choose the University of Missouri.

Emphasis should be placed on the liberal arts and the content major(s) for both elementary and secondary school teachers during the first four years of the teacher education program. Every teacher has a responsibility for developing student competence in reading.

Rationale: While the three groups discussing teacher preparation believed the study of pedagogy to be important, they indicated that in some majors, pedagogy is taught out of proportion to the general education and content major components. For example, in the words of one participant, "Five/twelfths of an elementary teacher's total education in the science of education is out of proportion!" Dr. Magrath (1985) expressed the desire of many when he said, ". . . each teacher education program should be built around an exacting and intellectually challenging integration of general liberal studies and specialization in an academic major and the academic content and practice of professional education."

The public schools and the University of Missouri will work jointly toward a paid induction year beyond the baccalaureate program for first-year teachers. The teaching of pedagogy shall continue during the induction year under the supervision of mentors or master teachers in the elementary and secondary schools.

Rationale: Dr. Lee Shulman (Shulman & Sykes, 1983) supports the concept of an induction year under the supervision of a master teacher when he says, "Rather than a sink-or-swim experience, the first year of teaching becomes an extension of the training program and establishes a further check point in the selection process. Costs may be spread among a university or college, a school district, and individual teachers so the burden on anyone is not onerous. Such a scheme tilts preservice education toward an apprenticeship model emphasizing practical experience with

professional support in the teacher's classroom without eroding the time devoted to academic preparation" (p. 105). Further, according to Dr. Shulman (Shulman & Sykes, 1983), the concept of an induction year ". . . will take a restructuring of the profession to make an intern year a truly valuable step on the road to becoming a master teacher" (p. 107).

The concept of "direct personal involvement" in the public schools by faculty teaching preservice teacher education is endorsed. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education shall provide broad implementation guidelines which allow for flexibility and encourage cooperation between local schools and colleges and universities.

Rationale: In many of his public pronouncements, including his presentation to the conferees, Dr. Arthur Mallory, Commissioner of Education for the State of Missouri, has voiced support for the concept of "direct personal involvement." On his speech to the conference, Dr. Mallory expressed the belief that schools are important and can be a rich source of ideas for teacher educators. Such involvement provides the teacher educator with the opportunity to keep current, conduct research, and experiment with new and innovative approaches to teaching and learning. Arrangements between schools and teacher education programs can be mutually beneficial. According to those in the teacher preparation discussion groups, within this spirit of cooperation, "The schools of education should be free to make individual arrangements with the local school districts. The Department of Elementary and Secondary Education's (DESE)

plans should not be too limiting and structured!" Especially during the implementation stages, DESE should allow sufficient flexibility with broadly defined implementation parameters. Such an arrangement would create a "mutual admiration society" between DESE, the schools and the teacher preparation institutions. Appropriate and mutually beneficial plans can be implemented within such a spirit of cooperation.

Inasmuch as college professors in all disciplines act as role models, inservice programs should be developed for college teachers to help them demonstrate effective teaching methods and strategies.

Rationale: Since members of the arts and science faculty are inextricably involved in the education of teachers, then it seems appropriate that College of Arts and Science, as well as College of Education faculty members, serve as role models for prospective teachers in the classes they teach. They, too, must demonstrate effective teaching methods and strategies.

Inservice Development of Educators and Collaboration with Schools

As the public schools opened their doors throughout Missouri last year, approximately 46,000 teachers, 3,500 administrators, and 4,400 librarians, counselors, and professional support personnel were on hand to provide learning and developmental experiences for over 800,000 of the state's children and young people. Of these nearly 54,000 certificated professional educators, approximately 1,800 were serving their first year in the district in which they were currently employed, 2,000 were serving their second year, and over 7,000 were serving their third, fourth, or fifth year. However, according to data available from the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, over 10,000 certificated professional educators were serving in their districts with six to nine years prior experience and nearly 21,000 were serving with 10 to 19 years experience in teaching, administrative, or professional support positions (Missouri State Board of Education, 1984).

One finds many suggestions offered in both professional and popular literature regarding essential characteristics, knowledge bases, skills, behaviors, and attitudes of beginning teachers--graduates of university-based teacher education programs. Deserving of equal if not greater attention are those school personnel who have already experienced teacher education, have already been certificated by a state agency as ready to enter the professional educator ranks, and who are already employed. The overwhelming majority of Missouri's educators have already been initiated into the profession and will never again be novices, rookies, or beginners. The emphasis then shifts logically to (1) ways in which professional

educators can be lifelong learners, (2) methods and means for providing effective continuing education programs, (3) the role of theory and research for experienced practitioners, and (4) cooperative networking for continuing education programming which involves state agencies, local school districts, and colleges and universities.

Professional development for teachers, administrators, and other professional personnel must be viewed as a career-long endeavor. The best educators are probably those who demonstrate a continued dedication to learning and to improving in their teaching, counseling, administration, and other role responsibilities and functions.

According to Talbert and Smoyer (1984), at least three stages have been identified which are shared by educators who remain in the profession for any length of time and who achieve some reputation for being effective in their roles. The first is that of job induction, that first year on the new job. Academic preparation programs at colleges and universities may prepare the novice in terms of knowledge, skills, some hands-on practice, as well as degrees and certificates of minimum competence. However, the induction year calls for a program of inservice development which addresses the rookie's need for some reality therapy and support, both professional and personal. The second stage is job integration, a period of time which may be thought of as those years between induction into the job and the granting of tenure. This is the time when educators begin to think of themselves as true professionals; at least those who remain in the profession begin to gain this sense of self and profession and make the "go/no go" decision regarding a lifelong commitment to education. Job enhancement is that stage in which educators have established themselves as competent professionals whose work is valued by students, colleagues, subordinates, superordinates, and themselves. It is

at this stage that individuals decide, either consciously or subconsciously, to maintain the status quo or continue to grow. Professional development efforts have to focus both on promoting the decision to grow and on avenues for growth.

A host of writers (for example, DeLattre, 1984; Goodlad, 1984) assert the essentialness of educators having active planning and decision-making roles in their own professional development. Likewise, the literature speaks eloquently to the need for collaborative models of professional development and inservice programming. This collaboration involves state education agencies, colleges and universities, local school district personnel, and advocacy groups drawn from representatives of teachers, students, parents, and the community at large. The role of each of these segments of the professional and the public is not the same, nor are they of equal authority in decision making. What is essential is that each has a role, has an appropriate interest, and has the potential to contribute.

Lanier, in her keynote presentation to the Conference, reported conclusions of her review of 201 separate sources in the literature which address specific issues related to teacher education, both preservice and continued career-long inservice. She reported that the literature notes several key deterrents, or roadblocks, which seem to impact adversely on efforts to develop effective inservice programs for educators. These include (1) a lack of career stages that advance learning, confounded by a limit on the rewards and opportunities based on evolving skill, sophistication, and professional standing; (2) a lack of support for entry into teaching, including the problem encountered by many first-year teachers as they are abruptly assigned full professional responsibilities of the classroom from their very first day; (3) a lack of collegial support for continued

learning, with existing collegial interactions frequently described as being passive, brief, fragmented, and intellectually narrow: (4) a lack of formal arrangements for continued learning, including problems associated with school districts, state agencies, and universities too often being engaged in turf-protecting and competition rather than in cooperative planning and coordinated action; and (5) a lack of a sufficient research base to guide planning and action, especially in regard to only limited applied, field-based research into what actually works in the classroom, the school building, and the school district.

Professional educator groups in Missouri and the Missouri General Assembly have demonstrated their sense of urgency for improving the career development of teachers, administrators, counselors, and other professional support personnel in the public schools of the state. Likewise, these educational and political leaders have taken into account some of the major deterrents to effective professional development and inservice programs for public school personnel and have carefully examined (1) the interactive but discrete roles of preservice education and inservice education for professional educators and (2) the collaborative but unique responsibilities of state agencies, universities, school districts, and professional educators themselves. That educational and political leaders have been attentive to Missouri's challenges and opportunities for improving the public schools of the state through improving the status and the capabilities of those already in the profession is evidenced in landmark legislation enacted during the 1985 session of the Missouri General Assembly.

This legislation, House Bill 463, known more properly as Missouri's Excellence in Education Act of 1985, includes six provisions which relate

directly to the inservice educational and career-long development of professional educators: (1) a career ladder program; (2) a requirement that each school district establish a professional development committee, composed of teachers selected by teachers; (3) a provision requiring assistance for beginning teachers who attended Missouri colleges or universities; (4) a provision of tuition reimbursement for school personnel who complete courses for credit at colleges and universities; (5) a requirement that all preservice teacher education professors be directly and personally involved in the public schools on a periodic basis; and (6) a financial assistance plan for local school districts, known as the Incentives for School Excellence Program which takes into account differential financial ability of districts throughout the state to fund their efforts to improve education.

Lessons from the literature, interesting and insightful presentations by leaders and scholars in teacher education, and Missouri's own legislative blueprint for school program improvement all were brought into discussions by participants during the Conference which focused on a partnership commitment. These inputs, plus the personal and professional experience and expertise of Conference participants, resulted in the following specific recommendations for graduate education and inservice programs, research, curriculum and program development, implementation of the Excellence in Education Act, planning, and evaluation.

Recommendations

Graduate Education and Inservice: The knowledge base of the University should be organized and deployed in ways that enhance its acquisition by educational personnel.

Departments and divisions within the University which are concerned with public school education should consult with school districts and regions and with professional educator organizations to determine what skills and knowledge bases are needed by teachers.

Departments and divisions within the University should make a systematic effort to coordinate and sequence regular courses, short courses, workshops, and other learning experiences for educators at times and in formats that would be accessible and meaningful to teachers, counselors, administrators, and other school personnel.

Departments and divisions within the University should consider the inclusion of a core of education courses within graduate degree programs, one essential to all educators regardless of emphasis area major.

Research: The discovery and application of new knowledge is critical to progress. Research, to be most useful, must address identified real needs of practice, be conducted by researchers who have firsthand knowledge of the real world of education and must be disseminated in usable form to the profession.

Every professional educator organization (e.g., Missouri Council for Teachers of English) should complete a review of the needs for research in each unique area of specialized content or role responsibility and communicate this information to the University as a "research agenda."

Teacher education institutions should accept responsibility for developing monographs on research in the various teaching areas. (For example, one institution might develop one on "What Research Says about Teaching Math in the Elementary School"; another might develop one on "What Research Says about College-Level Math for the High School Student.") These monographs should be disseminated to local school districts, colleges and universities, and the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education. The monographs should include various interpretations, applications, and implications of the research.

Educational researchers should be encouraged to spend time in the classroom, field testing and/or modeling their findings. They should also be available to serve as a resource for the school districts of the state.

When appropriate, more naturalistic inquiry (field and case study) methodology should be used in school settings, with increased emphasis on what is effective in different learning environments.

Research should be translated into forms which are more attractive to professional educators in the public schools and should be made available in a wider variety of means--for example, professional journals, newsletters, and two-page bulletins similar to those published in agricultural extension programs.

A unique set of circumstances confronts beginning teachers; for example, too often being overloaded with assignments and having inadequate time for class preparation. The University and other teacher preparation institutions should study the first-year teaching experience and incorporate into teacher preparation curriculums appropriate strategies for dealing with the realities of the professional induction year. These findings should be made known to school district leaders, and school administrators should become particularly sensitive to the total assignment of the beginning teacher.

The University could provide valuable assistance to Missouri school districts, the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and professional organizations by conducting research and evaluation related to different models of career ladder implementation and on the relative effectiveness of different models.

Curriculum and Program Development: The curriculum is the heart of the school. Therefore, it is important that continuous attention be given to it and that teachers be heavily involved as a part of inservice activity.

It is recommended that additional funding be made available throughout Missouri school districts for teacher inservice training which focuses on curriculum planning and revision and that particular attention be given to the need for more preparation in mathematics and science by elementary school teachers.

In curriculum revision, the process experienced by the teachers, counselors, administrators, and other personnel is often more beneficial than the actual outcomes. All teachers should be given opportunities to participate in such activities. The role of the University in curriculum development or revision at the local district level should be one of facilitating the process and being "on call."

Issues Related to the Excellence in Education Act of 1985: This act provides a series of incentives, challenges and opportunities. Higher education can and should play an important role in improvement of education under various provisions of the Act.

An expression of commendation is extended to the Missouri General Assembly and the Governor for their enactment of legislation which provides a comprehensive set of mandates, directions, and resources for the improvement of public education in the state of Missouri.

As established in the Excellence in Education Act, career ladders will increase the numbers of teachers participating in both inservice programs and graduate education courses of study. The University should develop a comprehensive plan for providing inservice experiences for educators and should facilitate the establishment of regional consortia for planning and presenting continuing education activities.

On-campus University courses should be more available as evening and summer classes, with special consideration given to staffing and offering courses in the teaching content areas for secondary school teachers.

Planning and Evaluation: Cooperative efforts and good communication are necessary for effective planning and timely execution of programs.

The University should take the initiative to establish a four-campus standing committee, similar to this conference membership, to include faculty and administrators from colleges of education and arts and science; representatives of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, and representatives of Missouri superintendents, principals, teachers, counselors, and support personnel. This committee should meet twice a year to discuss and review concerns regarding preservice and inservice training for teachers. Further, this committee should evaluate the effectiveness of cooperative partnership efforts and should make appropriate recommendations.

References

DeLattre, E. J. (1984). The paideia proposal and American education. In B. Ladner (Ed.), The humanities in precollegiate education. Chicago: National Society for the Study of Education.

Ferderer, Lance (Ed.) (1984). United States Department of Education. Bulletin. National Center for Education Statistics. Washington, D.C.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). Improving the schools we have. A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lanier, J. E. (1985). Research on teacher education. In M. C. Whittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (third edition). New York: MacMillan.

Mcgrath, C. Peter (1985). A call for change in teacher education. National Commission for Excellence in Teacher Education.

Missouri General Assembly (1985). The excellence in education act of 1985 (House Bill 463). Jefferson City, Missouri.

Missouri State Board of Education (1984). 135th report of the public schools of Missouri. Jefferson City, Missouri: Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Shulman, L. and Sykes, G. (Eds.) (1983). Handbook of teaching and policy. New York: Longman.

Talbert, R. E. and Smoyer, S. (Eds.) (1984). Perspectives on staff development: Implications for Oregon's collaborative approach to school improvement. Oregon Council for Continued Professional Development and Oregon State Board of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 250 814)

A Resolution of Affirmation

Recognizing that effective teacher education is a central and critical issue for the nation and for universities and that quality education at all levels is dependent upon the quality of individuals attracted to the profession and the quality of their preparation, this conference affirms

--the necessity for joint school and university effort in the recruitment and preparation of teachers.

--the necessity for serious and continuing university commitment to a teacher education program characterized by a balanced integration of general liberal studies and professional education supported by the judicious allocation of the resources required for rigorous preservice and inservice teacher preparation and the promotion of scholarly inquiry related to pupil learning and how such learning can best be encouraged and directed.

--the necessity for schools, themselves, to upgrade the conditions they provide for learning and teaching, communicate effectively their needs to the public they serve and use the resources of universities in a common endeavor to fulfill a commitment both have to society.

--the necessity for continuing, vigorous leadership on the part of the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education in further extending educational opportunity for Missouri's children and youth, utilizing university resources wheresoever possible and joining in common endeavors that benefit those who teach and those who learn.

Appendix A

PRECONFERENCE PLANNING COMMITTEE

Mrs. Ann Barefield
President
Missouri Association of Elementary
School Principals

Dr. John Bearden
Superintendent
Camdenton R-III Schools

Dr. Charles Campbell
Associate Vice Provost
Extension for Conferences and
Specialized Services

Mr. John Dye
Regional Director of the
Heritage Region
Missouri Parent Teachers Association

Dr. Robert Elsea
Executive Director
Cooperating School Districts of the
St. Louis Suburban Area

Dr. Milton Glick
Dean
UMC College of Arts and Science

Mr. Robert Johnson
President
Missouri School Boards Association

Dr. Charles Koelling
Associate Dean
UMC College of Education

Dr. Thomas Lawson
Superintendent
Hazelwood R-I School District

Mr. Michael Lord
Assistant Executive Secretary
Missouri State Teachers Association

Dr. Michael McManis
Deputy Commissioner
Missouri Department of Higher
Education

Dr. W. R. Miller
Associate Dean
UMC College of Education

Representative Annette Morgan
Missouri District 41

Dr. Donald Northington
President
Missouri Association of School
Administrators

Dr. H. W. Schooling
Chancellor Emeritus
University of Missouri-Columbia

Dr. Theodore Tarkow
Associate Dean
UMC College of Arts and Science

Dr. Russell Thompson
Superintendent
Columbia Public Schools

Dr. Wayne Walker
Principal
Rock Bridge Senior High School

Mr. William Wasson
Deputy Commissioner
Missouri Department of
Elementary and Secondary
Education

Dr. Bob G. Woods
Dean
UMC College of Education

Appendix B

CONFEREES

Robert Atkin	Superintendent Ravtown Public Schools
Otis Baker	Assistant Commissioner Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Robert Bartman	Assistant Commissioner Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Jay Barton	Vice President of Academic Affairs University of Missouri-Columbia
Eliot Battle	Director of Pupil Personnel Services Columbia Public Schools
Muriel Battle	Principal West Junior High School, Columbia
John Bauman	University of Missouri-Columbia
John Bearden	Superintendent Camdenton Public Schools
Jo Behymer	University of Missouri-Columbia
Gregory Black	University of Missouri-Kansas City
James Braden	Superintendent Waynesville School District
Bob Breitenbach	University of Missouri-Columbia
Gerald Brouder	Associate Provost, Academic Affairs University of Missouri-Columbia
Everett Brown	Missouri State Representative
Ronald Bunn	Provost University of Missouri-Columbia
E. Dean Burns	Superintendent Mehlville School District
Robert Callis	University of Missouri-Columbia
Charles Campbell	Associate Vice Provost of Extension University of Missouri-Columbia

Paul Cochran	Teacher Northwest High School, Hughesville
Peggy Cochran	Board of Directors Missouri National Education Association
Wayne Cogell	University of Missouri-Rolla
Donna Cox	Principal Holland Elementary School, Springfield
Jeanne Crews	Teacher Mehlville School District
Gene Denisar	Superintendent North Kansas City Schools
Gary Deskins	Superintendent Clinton Public Schools
Robert Dollar	University of Missouri-Columbia
Stephen Douglas	University of Missouri-Rolla
Wayne Dumas	University of Missouri-Columbia
Tom Duncan	Assistant for Education and Policy Management Governor's Office
James Eden	Superintendent Chillicothe School District
Robert Elsea	Executive Secretary, St. Louis County Cooperative School Districts
Richard Erickson	University of Missouri-Columbia
Eugene Eubanks	Dean, School of Education University of Missouri-Kansas City
Carl Fehrle	University of Missouri-Columbia
Celeste Ferguson	Assistant Commissioner Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Earl Finley	Superintendent Knob Noster School District
Marvin Fleming	Principal Jefferson City High School

Larry Folkins	Superintendent Jefferson City School District
William Foster	Superintendent Rockwood School District, Eureka
William Franzen	Dean, School of Education University of Missouri-St. Louis
Tom Freeman	University of Missouri-Columbia
Willie Giles, Jr.	Director of Secondary Schools Kansas City School District
Nicholas Ginos	Assistant Superintendent Rolla Public Schools
Milton Glick	Dean, College of Arts and Science University of Missouri-Columbia
Tom Good	University of Missouri-Columbia
Victor Gragg	Superintendent Ft. Osage School District
Sister Jeanne Granville	Archdiocese of St. Louis
Barbara Giardina	Teacher Hazelwood School District
Dalton Ham	Superintendent East Newton County School District
Bill Hampton	Principal McCluer North Senior High School Ferguson-Florissant School District
Veralee Hardin	University of Missouri-Columbia
Richard Hatley	University of Missouri-Columbia
Barbara Holder	Reading Specialist Blue Springs School District
Robert Howe	Principal North Kansas City Senior High School
Francis Huss	Assistant Superintendent Hazelwood School District
Otis Jackson	Assistant Provost University of Missouri-Columbia
Owen Jackson	Assistant Superintendent Columbia School District

Ken Jacob	Missouri State Representative
Robert Johnson	President Missouri School Boards Association
Don Johnson	Assistant Principal Potosi High School
Terrence Jones	Dean, College of Arts & Science University of Missouri-St. Louis
Larry Kantner	University of Missouri-Columbia
Everett Keith	Executive Secretary Emeritus Missouri State Teachers Association
Jack Kinder	Executive Secretary Missouri State Teachers Association
Charles Koelling	University of Missouri-Columbia
Jack Krueger	University of Missouri-Kansas City
Virginia Kugel	Teacher Marshall School District
Judith Lanier	Dean, College of Education Michigan State University
Gil Lauer	Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum St. Charles School District
C. Peter Magrath	President University of Missouri
Arthur Mallory	Commissioner of Education Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Deanna Martin	Director, Center for Human Development University of Missouri-Kansas City
Dewayne Mason	Principal Hoech Middle School, St. Ann
Timothy Materer	University of Missouri-Columbia
Anita McDonald	University of Missouri-St. Louis
Don McClothlin	University of Missouri-Columbia
Charles McKenna	Superintendent Ladue School District

Charles McLaughlin	Teacher St. Joseph School District
Michael McManis	Coordinating Board for Higher Education
W. R. Miller	University of Missouri-Columbia
Annette Morgan	Missouri State Representative
Ben Nelms	University of Missouri-Columbia
Don Northington	Superintendent Washington School District
Ernest Oerly	Principal Boonville High School
Harry Oldweiler	Chair, Mathematics Department Hickman High School, Columbia
John Oren	Dean, Extension Division University of Missouri-Columbia
Sharon Price	Director of Special Services Camdenton Public Schools
Sanford Pridy	Principal Lindbergh Senior High School
Marvin Proffer	Missouri State Representative
Cameron Pulliam	Principal Mark Twain Elementary School, Brentwood
Bill Ray	Missouri Association of Community and Junior Colleges
Charles Schmitz	University of Missouri-Columbia
Herb Schooling	Chancellor Emeritus University of Missouri-Columbia
Elizabeth Schwartz	Assistant to Superintendent for Administration Ladue Public School District
Ralph Scott	Superintendent Monett School District
Dan Scotten	President Commerce Bank of Columbia

Gene Schwilck	President Danforth Foundation
Dennis Sentilles	University of Missouri-Columbia
Gary Sharpe	Director of Governmental Relations MASA, MAESP, and MASSP
Robert Shaw	University of Missouri-Columbia
Orlo Shroyer	Superintendent Montgomery County School District
Lee Shulman	Professor Stanford University
David Sippy	Principal Monett Senior High School
Max Skidmore	Dean, Arts & Science University of Missouri-Kansas City
Paula Sommers	University of Missouri-Columbia
Hank Steere	University of Missouri-Columbia
Ralph Stewart	University of Missouri-Columbia
Terry Stewart	Coordinator Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
John Stolt	Associate Superintendent Columbia Public Schools
Barbara Stratton	Teacher Maywood School District
J. Chris Straub	Superintendent Hannibal School District
Robert Strom	University of Missouri-Columbia
Ted Tarkow	University of Missouri-Columbia
Michael Thacker	Teacher McCluer North High School Ferguson-Florissant School District
Irwin Thomas	Superintendent Carrollton School District
Russell Thompson	Superintendent Columbia School District

Clifford Tompson	University of Missouri-Columbia
Gerald Troester	Superintendent St. Joseph Public Schools
Turner Tyson	Director, Teacher Education and Certification Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Wayne Walker	Principal Rock Bridge High School, Columbia
Richard Wallace	Associate Vice President, Academic Affairs University of Missouri
Carter Ward	Executive Director Missouri School Boards Association
Bill Wasson	Deputy Commissioner Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education
Frank Wiley	Superintendent Jackson School District
Roger Wilson	Missouri State Senator
John Windom	Director of Community Education St. Louis School District
Bob Woods	Dean, College of Education University of Missouri-Columbia
Gary Wright	Superintendent Lindbergh School District
Sister Marla Yeck	Archdiocese of St. Louis

Appendix C

ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY AND UNIVERSITY EDUCATION:
A PARTNERSHIP COMMITMENT

Conference Agenda

Friday, September 13

8:30 - 10:00	REGISTRATION (Rolls and Coffee)	- Memorial Union Second Floor North
10:00 - 11:15	FIRST GENERAL SESSION	- Memorial Union Large Ballroom

Introductions: Dean Bob G. Woods
College of Education

Welcome: Provost Ronald Bunn

Charge to Conferees: Dean Milton Glick
College of Arts and Science

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

"Reform in Teacher Education"

Dr. Judith Lanier, Dean
College of Education
Michigan State University

11:20 - 12:20	SMALL-GROUP DISCUSSION	- Memorial Union Large Ballroom
12:30 - 1:30	LUNCH	- Memorial Union Large Ballroom
1:30 - 2:15	SMALL-GROUP DISCUSSION	- Memorial Union Large Ballroom
2:20 - 3:20	SECOND GENERAL SESSION	- Memorial Union Large Ballroom

Introduction of Speaker: Provost Ronald Bunn

PRINCIPAL ADDRESS:

"Improving Education in Missouri: Toward Educational Excellence"

Dr. C. Peter Magrath, President
University of Missouri

3:20 - 3:40	BREAK	
3:45 - 4:30	SMALL-GROUP DISCUSSION	- Memorial Union Large Ballroom

4:30 - 6:00 FREE TIME (Moderators and Recorders Session)

5:30 - 7:00 SOCIAL HOUR - Ramada Inn
Country Room

7:00 - 7:45 DINNER - Ramada Inn
State Room

7:45 - THIRD GENERAL SESSION

Introduction of Speaker: Dr. Tom Good, Professor
College of Education

Presentation:

"University/Public School Collaboration"

Dr. Lee Shulman, Professor
Stanford University

Saturday, September 14

8:00 - 8:30 Rolls and Coffee - Memorial Union Large Ballroom

8:30 - 9:15 FOURTH GENERAL SESSION

Introduction of Speaker: Dr. Russell Thompson
Superintendent
Columbia Public Schools

Presentation:

"Educational Partnerships: A Perspective"

Dr. Arthur Mallory, Commissioner of Education
Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary
Education

9:15 - 10:00 SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION - Memorial Union Large Ballroom

10:00 - 10:20 BREAK (Moderators and Recorders Session)

10:25 - 11:30 REPORT OF RECOMMENDATIONS: An Agenda for Action

1:00 Attend Football Game, Visit Library, Tour Campus